

AN EVALUATION THROUGH TEACHER RATINGS
OF CURRENT SUPERVISORY PRACTICES

A Field Report
Presented to
The Graduate Division
Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science in Education

by
Joanne Sybil McRae
August, 1956

162-2-R
94

AN EVALUATION THROUGH TEACHER RATINGS
OF CURRENT SUPERVISORY PRACTICES

by

Joanne Sybil McRae

Approved by Committee:

Hazel Weakly
Chairman

Lee Brackett

Ronald J. Miller
Dean of the Graduate Division

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. THE PROBLEM: DEFINITION, DEVELOPMENT, AND | |
| REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 1 |
| The Problem | 1 |
| Statement of the problem | 1 |
| Importance of the problem | 3 |
| How the study was made | 7 |
| II. PRESENTATION OF DATA | 10 |
| Teacher Ratings of Supervisory Practices . . . | 12 |
| Practices Common to the Des Moines | |
| Elementary Schools | 12 |
| Practices Not Commonly Used in the | |
| Des Moines Elementary Schools | 19 |
| III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS | 24 |
| Summary | 24 |
| Conclusions | 27 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 30 |
| APPENDIX | 32 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. Percentage of Sixty Elementary Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956, who Have or Have Not Received Supervision at Some Time During Their Teaching Experiences | 10 |
| II. Percentage of Sixty Elementary Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956, who Would or Would Not Look with Favor on the Introduction of Supervision into Their School Programs | 11 |
| III. Ratings Given the Classroom Visit as a Supervisory Practice by Sixty Elementary Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956 | 13 |
| IV. Ratings Given Supervisor-Teacher and Building Conferences as Supervisory Practices by Sixty Elementary Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956 | 15 |
| V. Ratings Given Joint Supervisor-Teacher Curriculum Planning and Evaluation by Sixty Elementary Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956 | 16 |
| VI. Ratings Given the Practice of Intra-school Visitation--New Teachers with Experienced Teachers--by Sixty Elementary Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956 | 17 |
| VII. Ratings Given the Practice of Assigning Experienced Teachers to Assist New Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956 | 18 |
| VIII. Ratings Given the Intra-school Bulletin by Sixty Elementary Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956 | 18 |

TABLE

PAGE

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| IX. | Ratings Given Supervisory Helps Through Teaching Aids such as Materials, Books, and Articles by Sixty Elementary Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956 | 19 |
| X. | Ratings Given the Practice of Non-credit, In-service Courses or Workshops by Sixty Elementary Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956 | 20 |
| XI. | Ratings Given Teacher Participation in the Formulation of School Policy by Sixty Elementary Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956 | 21 |
| XII. | Ratings Given the Orientation Program for New Teachers by Sixty Elementary Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956 | 21 |
| XIII. | Ratings Given Periodic Written Evaluation--Self-evaluation and Evaluation of the Teacher by the Supervisor--by Sixty Elementary Teachers in Six Small Communities near Des Moines, Iowa, Spring, 1956 | 22 |

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM: DEFINITION, DEVELOPMENT, AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

What do teachers think of the present practices of instructional supervision? Are these practices as helpful as supervisors may think they are? Is it possible that some even may be detrimental? What can supervisors learn from teachers' evaluations of practices which have as their goal the improvement of teachers in service?¹ While much has been written within the past quarter of a century regarding instructional supervision in school operation, these volumes seldom have touched upon the point of view of the teacher.²

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The conclusions of a field report submitted to Drake University in August, 1955, by Frank C. Lorey, Jr. indicate that, although the elementary schools of Des Moines, Iowa do not have a supervisory program

¹Henry Antell, "Teachers Appraise Supervision," Journal Of Educational Research, XXXVIII (April, 1945), 607.

²M. J. Whitehead, "Teachers Look At Supervision," Educational Leadership, X (November, 1952), 101.

on paper, such a program does exist in effect since an overwhelming majority of the city's thirty-five elementary school principals use the same supervisory practices and procedures.¹ It was further concluded that:

This study has a definite implication for future research on the supervisory practices in the Des Moines Elementary Schools. It would seem that at some future time a study of teachers' attitudes toward this supervisory program should be of great value.²

While it was not possible to gain permission to conduct such a follow-up study of teacher attitudes in the schools of Des Moines, a similar problem based on Mr. Lorey's findings was undertaken in the following field report. Six small communities--Ankeny, Johnston, Martensdale, Norwalk, Urbandale, and Waukee--were involved. All of these communities are within nineteen miles of Des Moines; none offer supervision to their teachers. The purpose of the study was to investigate and attempt to answer three questions: (1) Would teachers not receiving supervision look upon such a program favorably should it be offered to them? (2) How do teachers rate supervisory practices common to the Des Moines Elementary Schools? (3) Are there

¹Frank C. Lorey, Jr., "Supervisory Practices In The Des Moines Elementary Schools," (Unpublished Master's field report, Drake University, Des Moines, 1955), p. 42.

²Ibid., p. 44.

supervisory techniques not listed in Des Moines' program which teachers rate desirable?

Importance of the problem. Harold Spears has stated that the teacher is paramount in any school setting.¹ In connection with instructional supervision he says:

Perhaps the value of a supervisory program can best be measured by the affection and respect shown for it by the teachers.²

.

Evaluation seems to have a two-way action. Just as the supervisor judges the instructional efforts of the teacher, likewise the teacher is judging the supervisory efforts of the supervisor.³

.

. . . discussion of the reception of supervision by the teacher might be summed up with one statement: Supervision must satisfy the teacher as well as the supervisor.⁴

Growing out of the philosophy expressed above, there has been a trend in recent years to view supervision as an aim not only toward the growth of pupil and teacher, but of the supervisory staff itself.⁵ As a result, there have been a number of teacher surveys to compare the types of supervisory services which teachers desire with those which

¹Harold Spears, Improving The Supervision Of Instruction (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953), p. 443.

²Ibid. ³Ibid., p. 445. ⁴Ibid., p. 448.

⁵William T. Melchior, Instructional Supervision (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1950), p. 8.

they receive.

One such study involved two hundred New York elementary teachers in eight schools.¹ Twenty-five of the most common practices of supervision were made part of a questionnaire answered by representative teachers. Conclusions were that teachers favor those supervisory practices which give them the widest latitude to participate in curriculum improvement, which make sources of pertinent information available, and which give them genuine assistance. They resent all forms of imposition, want help in their everyday tasks, and do not care for inspectional supervision. A further conclusion was:

Apparently, to some extent, supervisors and teachers are not agreed upon the real purposes and techniques of supervision. An obvious deduction is that there must be a free flow of opinion so that there will be common understandings.

Supervisors should readjust their thinking in regard to the value of the various supervisory practices. If the latter are to be used with the chief purpose of improving teachers in service, they should be constantly evaluated on this basis. Merely standing the test of time is not a proper qualification for an approved supervisory practice.²

A second study concerned with comparing supervisory practices in use with those desired by the teachers, took place during a summer session at Butler University.³

¹Antell, loc. cit.

²Ibid., p. 611.

³P. M. Bail, "Do Teachers Receive The Kind Of Supervision They Desire?" Journal Of Educational Research, XL (May, 1947), 713.

Twenty-three graduate students personally interviewed 460 school personnel -- teachers, principals, and superintendents. Conclusions were: (1) teachers most frequently desire supervision which provides constructive criticism, new techniques and methods, demonstration teaching, and suggested materials and equipment, and (2) teachers do not receive from supervision the services they desire.

A third study of similar nature was done in North Carolina.¹ Through a questionnaire, M. J. Whitehead surveyed supervisory views of 115 teachers in negro high schools representing sixty-nine out of one hundred counties. Whitehead found that: (1) 96 per cent of the teachers stated they enjoyed their work, (2) 76 per cent of the teachers felt that their supervisors were democratic in school administration, and (3) 82 per cent agreed that the principals utilized the group process in planning. Among other findings, the study showed that teachers favor classroom visits under certain conditions. A well planned visit followed by an individual conference was considered beneficial to improvement of teaching by one hundred per cent. As to the views of the teachers regarding the purposes of the visit: (1) 80 per cent said the supervisory visit

¹Whitehead, loc. cit.

was made for the purpose of improving instruction, and (2) 20 per cent said the purpose of the visit was to rate the teachers and to inspect the physical features.¹ Whitehead's final conclusion was that both administrators and teachers had re-examined and re-thought their philosophies of education and had placed the improvement of instruction above the minutiae which sometimes are responsible for diverting educational institutions from their chief purpose of teaching.²

The teacher who works directly with the child is, perhaps, the single most important force in the educational system. To quote John Bartky:

The teacher is the only possible intermediary between contemporary society and the child. Curriculum, methodology, audio-visual aids, etc., are her tools. Supervisors are her teachers and helpers. The curriculum cannot do the job alone. It is an inanimate thing, a device which requires the guidance of a skilled operator. The same for methodology, audio-visual aids, and other tools. Neither can the supervisor do the teacher's job.³

Good staff relations between supervisors and teachers are essential to the ultimate goal of helping teachers do a better job. "Morale has come to be regarded as the prime requisite for an efficient and effective organization in

¹Ibid., p. 102.

²Ibid., p. 106.

³John Bartky, "Helping Teachers Teach," School And Society, LXVI (September, 1947), p. 224.

education as well as in business."¹ If it is to be effective, administration must be a cooperative enterprise. There must be an awareness of attitudes, a concern for human relations, a striving toward a true teamwork approach, and a general application of democratic processes. Portions of a recent book on staff relations state:

Educational goals and purposes should become the criteria by which principles, practices, and results are continually appraised.²

.....

Every administrator should try to find out what his staff really thinks of him just as each teacher should try to know the attitude of his class. This knowledge may not always be comforting, but it is usually excellent medicine for a bad case of complacency.

It is important to determine whether there is a feeling of belongingness and understanding on the part of administrators, teachers, pupils, and parents. Since the school exists for teaching and learning, the effects of staff relations in this area are quite significant.³

.....

Much of the evaluation of good staff relationships must concern itself with the presence of good practices and conditions, because the ultimate effect of such practices upon boys and girls may never be fully or completely known. Such an evaluation, then, may look for the number of good practices and attempt to appraise their quality in relation to the conditions they seem to produce.⁴

¹Staff Relations In School Administration (Thirty-Third Yearbook. Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1955), p. 224.

²Ibid., p. 217.

³Ibid., p. 221.

⁴Ibid., p. 223.

How the study was made. Data was collected from a questionnaire sent to eighty teachers in six small communities near Des Moines. Ankeny, Johnston, Martensdale, Norwalk, Urbandale, and Waukee were involved. The questionnaire was based primarily upon information taken from the previously mentioned field study on the supervisory program in Des Moines.¹ To quote, in part, from the conclusions of this study:

. . . (1) Principals visit classrooms to observe procedures. (2) Principals visit classrooms unannounced. (3) Principals occasionally schedule visits. (4) Principals keep written records of impressions of the observations. (5) Principals occasionally make a pre-visitation diagnosis of the purpose of the visit with the teacher. (6) Principals hold a post-visitation conference with the teachers. (7) Principals hold other types of individual conferences with the teachers. (8) Principals participate in classroom activities. (9) Principals visit teachers not on probation. (10) Principals do curriculum planning and evaluating with teachers. (11) Principals hold departmental conferences. (12) Principals hold building meetings. (13) Principals have intra-school visitations of new teachers with experienced teachers. (14) Principals have inter-school visitations of new teachers with experienced teachers. (15) Principals assign experienced teachers to assist new teachers. (16) Principals have a type of intra-school bulletin. (17) Principals offer indirect help to teachers in the form of teaching aids. (18) Principals spend less than half their time on supervision.

A copy of the questionnaire will be found in the appendix of this field report. It will be noted that it is made up of a rating scale concerned with: (1) common

¹Lorey, op. cit., pp. 42-43.

supervisory practices used in the Des Moines Elementary Schools, and (2) other supervisory techniques not commonly used in the Des Moines Schools. The teachers were asked to rate each of twenty listed supervisory practices by placing a check mark in one of the five columns headed: Very Helpful, Some Help, Little Help, No Help, or Detrimental. Since the teachers receiving the questionnaire were not under a supervisory program at the time of the survey, they were requested to indicate: (1) whether they had received instructional supervision at any time during their teaching experience, and (2) if they would look on supervision favorably should it be offered them. They also were asked to select one of the following statements as the best description of the chief purpose of supervision: (1) To rate teacher performance, and serve as a guide for job promotion; (2) To aid teachers with their work in order to increase expertness; or (3) To set up a specific curriculum to be followed by all teachers in order to assure a properly integrated program.

There was a 75 per cent return (sixty out of eighty) on the questionnaire. The data gathered from replies were used to indicate answers to the three questions stated early in this chapter regarding the purpose of the study.

CHAPTER II

PRESENTATION OF DATA

All of the sixty elementary teachers who returned the questionnaire were women. The years of teaching experience ranged from one to forty-four with an average of ten and one-half years. Kindergarten through sixth grade were represented. As shown in Table I, 50 per cent of the teachers indicated they had received instructional supervision

TABLE I

PERCENTAGE OF SIXTY ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN SIX SMALL
COMMUNITIES NEAR DES MOINES, IOWA, SPRING, 1956,
WHO HAVE OR HAVE NOT RECEIVED SUPERVISION
AT SOME TIME DURING THEIR TEACHING
EXPERIENCES

| | Total | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Have received supervision | 30 | 50.0 |
| Have not received supervision . . | 25 | 41.7 |
| Wrote in "some" or "very little". | 3 | 5.0 |
| No response | 2 | 3.3 |

at some time during their teaching experiences; 41.7 per cent indicated they had never received instructional supervision; and 5 per cent filled in the words "some" or "very little." Table II shows that in answer to the question, "Would you

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE OF SIXTY ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN SIX SMALL
COMMUNITIES NEAR DES MOINES, IOWA, SPRING, 1956,
WHO WOULD OR WOULD NOT LOOK WITH FAVOR ON
THE INTRODUCTION OF SUPERVISION INTO
THEIR SCHOOL PROGRAMS

| | Total | Percentage |
|--|-------|------------|
| Would favor supervision | 48 | 80.0 |
| Would not favor supervision . . . | 3 | 5.0 |
| Wrote in "depends on practices and particular supervisor" . . . | 5 | 8.3 |
| No response | 4 | 6.7 |

look favorably on supervision should it be offered to you?" 80 per cent checked "yes," and 5 per cent, "no." A total of 8.3 per cent did not check either answer, but wrote in comments indicating that acceptance of a supervisory program would depend on the type of practices employed and the personality of the particular supervisor.

In regard to the three statements from which the teachers were asked to select the one best describing the chief purpose of supervision, the results were as follows:

| <u>Statement</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|---|--------------|-------------------|
| To rate teacher performance, and serve as a guide for job promotion and salary increase | 1 | 1.7 |
| To aid teachers with their work in order to increase expertness | 41 | 68.3 |
| To set up a specific curriculum to be followed by all teachers in order to assure a properly integrated program | 14 | 23.3 |

The remaining four teachers (6.7 per cent) checked both the second and third statements, and wrote in comments to the effect that, "In my opinion, teacher growth and a specific curriculum to be followed by everyone must be worked out together. They are both part of the supervisor's job and I do not see how they can be separated."¹

TEACHER RATINGS OF SUPERVISORY PRACTICES

As stated in Chapter I, the main body of the questionnaire was made up of a rating scale concerned with: (1) supervisory practices in common use in the Des Moines Elementary Schools, and (2) supervisory techniques not commonly used in the Des Moines Elementary Schools. Teacher ratings, divided into the two categories listed above, will be found in the remainder of this chapter.

I. PRACTICES COMMON TO THE DES MOINES ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Ratings of the classroom visit as a supervisory practice, as shown in Table III, reveal that 43.3 per cent of the sixty teachers surveyed considered it very helpful; 45 per cent rated it of some help; a total of 10 per cent, of little or no help; and none of the teachers rated it as

¹Typical comment quoted from a questionnaire return.

TABLE III

RATINGS GIVEN THE CLASSROOM VISIT AS A SUPERVISORY
PRACTICE BY SIXTY ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN SIX
SMALL COMMUNITIES NEAR DES MOINES, IOWA,
SPRING, 1956

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Very help- ful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental | No response |
| Classroom visit to observe procedures . . . | 43.3 | 45.0 | 6.7 | 3.3 | ---- | 1.7 |
| Unannounced classroom visit. | 16.7 | 33.3 | 26.7 | 11.7 | 8.3 | 3.3 |
| Scheduled classroom visit. | 36.7 | 36.7 | 18.3 | 6.7 | 1.7 | ---- |
| Classroom visit to experienced teacher not on probation . . . | 21.7 | 51.7 | 15.0 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 6.7 |
| Participation by supervisor in classroom activities . . . | 25.0 | 20.0 | 21.7 | 15.0 | 16.7 | 1.7 |
| Pre-visitation diagnosis of purpose of visit | 38.3 | 31.7 | 18.3 | 5.0 | 1.7 | 5.0 |
| Post-visitation conference, supervisor and teacher | 75.0 | 15.0 | 5.0 | 1.7 | ---- | 3.3 |
| Observations kept in written form | 43.3 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 1.7 |

generally detrimental. Teachers rated the unannounced classroom visit as less helpful than the scheduled visit. In contrast to a total of 50 per cent teachers who rated the unannounced visit as either very helpful, or of some help, a total of 73.3 per cent teachers rated the scheduled visit in one of these classifications. Five teachers (8.3 per cent) considered the unannounced visit detrimental, while only one teacher (1.7 per cent) rated the scheduled visit as such. However, one teacher wrote in criticism of the scheduled visit, "I believe too many would make a special effort to have something special planned for these visits. A good teacher is ready for a visit at any time."

In rating the classroom visit to the experienced teacher not on probation, 21.7 per cent considered the practice very helpful; 51.7 per cent of some help; and 15 per cent, of little help.

Teachers did not rate participation by the supervisor in classroom activities as highly desirable. While 25 per cent thought supervisory participation very helpful and 20 per cent rated it of some help, a total of 36.7 per cent considered the practice of little or no help, and 16.7 per cent rated it as actually detrimental.

A pre-visitation diagnosis of the purpose of the visit was rated very helpful by 38.3 per cent; of some help by 31.7 per cent; of little help by 18.3 per cent; and of no

help by 5 per cent. While these figures indicate that teachers thought the pre-visitation diagnosis of value, ratings of the post-visitation conference show that this practice was considered even more desirable. A total of 90 per cent rated the post-visitation conference helpful--75 per cent, very helpful, and 15 per cent, of some help.

Over three-fourths of the teachers thought that the supervisory observations made during the classroom visit should be kept in written form; 43.3 per cent rated written observations as very helpful, 33.3 per cent, of some help.

Supervisory-teacher conferences for purposes other than discussion of classroom visits were rated high by teachers. As shown in Table IV, 63.3 per cent considered

TABLE IV

RATINGS GIVEN SUPERVISOR-TEACHER AND BUILDING
CONFERENCES AS SUPERVISORY PRACTICES
BY SIXTY ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN
SIX SMALL COMMUNITIES NEAR
DES MOINES, IOWA,
SPRING, 1956

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Very help- ful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental | No response |
| Supervisor-teacher conferences for purposes other than post- visitation | 63.3 | 30.0 | 6.7 | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Departmental conferences . . . | 55.0 | 36.7 | 6.7 | ---- | ---- | 1.7 |

conferences very helpful, and 30 per cent considered them of some help. A comparable percentage favored departmental conferences, with 55 per cent rating them very helpful, and 36.7 per cent, of some help.

Teachers viewed joint supervisor-teacher curriculum planning and evaluation as highly desirable, as illustrated by the figures in Table V. A total of 96.7 per cent rated

TABLE V

RATINGS GIVEN JOINT SUPERVISOR-TEACHER
CURRICULUM PLANNING AND EVALUATION
BY SIXTY ELEMENTARY TEACHERS
IN SIX SMALL COMMUNITIES
NEAR DES MOINES, IOWA,
SPRING, 1956

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Very help- ful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental | No response |
| Supervisor- teacher cur- riculum planning and evaluation | 71.7 | 25.0 | 1.7 | ---- | ---- | 1.7 |

the practice as either very helpful or of some help.

Table VI shows that intra-school visitation by new teachers with more experienced teachers was believed to be very helpful by 55 per cent; of some help by 30 per cent; of little or no help by 6.7 per cent; and actually detrimental by 5 per cent.

TABLE VI

RATINGS GIVEN THE PRACTICE OF INTRA-SCHOOL VISITATION--
 NEW TEACHERS WITH EXPERIENCED TEACHERS--BY
 SIXTY ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN SIX SMALL
 COMMUNITIES NEAR DES MOINES, IOWA,
 SPRING, 1956

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Very help- ful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental | No response |
| Intra-school visitation by new teachers with experienced teachers | 55.0 | 30.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 5.0 | 3.3 |

The practice of assigning experienced teachers to assist new teachers was not regarded as highly desirable as the intra-school visitation. While 41.7 per cent rated such assignments very helpful, and 36.7 per cent rated them of some help, 10 per cent considered them of little help, and 5 per cent, thought them actually detrimental. The lack of teacher response to the rating of this practice was 6.7 per cent. This percentage of no response was second only to that of the intra-school bulletin. The above figures will be found in Table VII.

TABLE VII

RATINGS GIVEN THE PRACTICE OF ASSIGNING EXPERIENCED
TEACHERS TO ASSIST NEW TEACHERS BY SIXTY
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN SIX SMALL
COMMUNITIES NEAR DES MOINES,
IOWA, SPRING, 1956

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Very help- ful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental | No response |
| Experienced teachers assigned to assist new teachers | 41.7 | 36.7 | 10.0 | ---- | 5.0 | 6.7 |

As shown in Table VIII, the intra-school bulletin was

TABLE VIII

RATINGS GIVEN THE INTRA-SCHOOL BULLETIN BY SIXTY
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN SIX SMALL COMMUNITIES
NEAR DES MOINES, IOWA, SPRING, 1956

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Very help- ful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental | No response |
| Intra-school bulletin | 45.0 | 38.3 | 6.7 | 1.7 | ---- | 8.3 |

rated helpful by a total of 83.3 per cent of the teachers--
45 per cent of that total regarded the practice very helpful.
The bulletin was considered of little or no help by 8.3 per cent.

It will be noted in Table IX that supervisory helps through teacher aids such as materials, books, and articles

TABLE IX

RATINGS GIVEN SUPERVISORY HELPS THROUGH TEACHING AIDS
SUCH AS MATERIALS, BOOKS, AND ARTICLES BY SIXTY
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN SIX SMALL COMMUNITIES
NEAR DES MOINES, IOWA, SPRING, 1956

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Very help- ful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental | No response |
| Helps through teaching aids such as mater- ials, books, and articles | 83.3 | 16.7 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |

were viewed very helpful by 83.3 per cent, and of some help by the remaining 16.7 per cent. Of the twenty supervisory techniques rated in this study, that of "helps through teaching aids" was the only one regarded either very helpful or of some help by all sixty teachers.

II. PRACTICES NOT COMMONLY USED IN THE DES MOINES ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

The supervisory practice of non-credit, in-service courses or workshops, as shown in Table X, was rated very helpful by 31.7 per cent teachers, of some help by 48.3 per

TABLE X

RATINGS GIVEN THE PRACTICE OF NON-CREDIT, IN-SERVICE
COURSES OR WORKSHOPS BY SIXTY ELEMENTARY TEACHERS
IN SIX SMALL COMMUNITIES NEAR DES MOINES, IOWA,
SPRING, 1956

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Very help- ful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental | No response |
| Non-credit, in- service courses or workshops | 31.7 | 48.3 | 11.7 | 3.3 | ---- | 5.0 |

cent, and of little help by 11.7 per cent. One of the two teachers who rated the non-credit course or workshop of no help felt, "If workshops and courses are offered, teachers should get credit for them. A teacher's time is valuable--so I believe the teacher should receive credit, and especially if they are required and taken on the teacher's own time. If no credit is offered--they should have the time accounted for and either taken out of their school day or paid for it. . . ." The second teacher to rate the practice of no help wrote in briefly, "I've had them!"

Teacher participation in the formulation of school policy was believed helpful by 95 per cent of the teachers surveyed. Table XI reveals that 66.7 per cent rated the practice very helpful, and 28.3 per cent considered it of some help.

TABLE XI

RATINGS GIVEN TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN THE FORMULATION
OF SCHOOL POLICY BY SIXTY ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN
SIX SMALL COMMUNITIES NEAR DES MOINES, IOWA,
SPRING, 1956

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Very help- ful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental | No response |
| Teacher partici- pation in the formulation of school policy | 66.7 | 28.3 | 1.7 | ---- | ---- | 3.3 |

As shown in Table XII, teachers regarded an orientation
program for new teachers worth-while. A total of 73.3 per

TABLE XII

RATINGS GIVEN THE ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR NEW TEACHERS
BY SIXTY ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN SIX SMALL
COMMUNITIES NEAR DES MOINES, IOWA,
SPRING, 1956

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Very help- ful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental | No response |
| Orientation program for new teachers | 73.3 | 25.0 | 1.7 | ---- | ---- | ---- |

cent rated such a program very helpful, 25 per cent rated it

of some help. Only one teacher (1.7 per cent) thought the practice of little help.

Periodic written evaluations--teacher self-evaluation and evaluation of the teacher by the supervisor--were rated generally helpful by teachers. Table XIII shows that of the

TABLE XIII

RATINGS GIVEN PERIODIC WRITTEN EVALUATION--
SELF-EVALUATION AND EVALUATION OF THE
TEACHER BY THE SUPERVISOR--BY SIXTY
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN SIX SMALL
COMMUNITIES NEAR DES MOINES,
IOWA, SPRING, 1956

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Very help- ful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental | No response |
| Periodic written teacher self- evaluation | 65.0 | 23.3 | 6.7 | 1.7 | 3.3 | ---- |
| Periodic written evaluation of the teacher by the supervisor . . | 38.3 | 45.0 | 5.0 | 1.7 | 8.3 | 1.7 |

two types of evaluation, the self-evaluation was favored by more teachers, with 65 per cent rating it very helpful, and 23.3 per cent rating it of some help. Two teachers (3.3 per cent) thought the self-evaluation detrimental. A periodic teacher evaluation written by the supervisor was considered

very helpful by 38.3 per cent; of some help by 45 per cent;
and actually detrimental by 8.3 per cent.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate and attempt to answer three questions: (1) Would teachers not receiving supervision look upon such a program favorably should it be offered to them? (2) How do teachers rate supervisory practices common to the Des Moines Elementary Schools? (3) Are there supervisory techniques not listed in Des Moines' program which teachers rate desirable?

Data were collected from a questionnaire sent to eighty teachers in six small communities near Des Moines, Iowa. The elementary schools of Ankeny, Johnston, Martensdale, Norwalk, Urbandale, and Waukee--none of which have a supervision program--were involved. The main part of the questionnaire listed twenty supervisory practices which teachers were asked to rate according to degrees of helpfulness to the improvement of their work. Although no distinction was made between the practices listed, fifteen were taken from Des Moines' program as established through a recent field study, and five were well-known techniques not commonly used by Des Moines principals.

There was a 75 per cent return (sixty out of eighty) on the questionnaire.

Of the sixty teachers (all women) who returned the questionnaire, 50 per cent had received supervision at some time during their teaching experiences. Four-fifths of the teachers (80 per cent) would look favorably upon the introduction of supervision into their school programs; 5 per cent did not want supervision; and 8.3 per cent felt acceptance would depend on the practices employed, and the particular supervisor.

In selecting the statement best describing the chief purpose of supervision, 68.3 per cent chose the one reading, "To aid teachers with their work in order to increase expertness." Only one teacher chose rating of teacher performance for job promotion and salary increase as supervision's main concern.

Teachers rated the classroom visit as generally helpful if: (1) the visit was scheduled, (2) there was a pre-visitation diagnosis of the purpose of the visit, (3) the supervisor's observations were kept in written form and discussed in a post-visitation conference, and (4) the supervisor did not participate in classroom activities. Participation by the supervisor in classroom activities was rated actually detrimental by 16.7 per cent of the teachers. The post-visitation conference was considered very helpful by 75 per cent.

Of the other practices commonly used in the Des Moines

Elementary Schools, two were rated very helpful by teachers: (1) supervisor-teacher curriculum planning and evaluation (very helpful, 71.7 per cent); and (2) supervisory helps through teaching aids such as materials, books, and articles (very helpful, 83.3 per cent). The latter practice received the highest rating of the twenty listed on the questionnaire.

All the remaining supervisory techniques used by the principals in the Des Moines Elementary Schools--supervisor-teacher and departmental conferences; intra-school visitations, new teachers with experienced teachers; assigning experienced teachers to assist new teachers; and the intra-school bulletin--were rated generally helpful by teachers. These practices received "very helpful" or "some help" ratings (the two columns totaled) ranging from 83.3 per cent to 93.3 per cent.

Teacher ratings of the five supervisory practices not commonly used in the Des Moines Elementary Schools revealed that teachers did consider these techniques of value.

Results of ratings were:

1. The orientation program for new teachers was rated very helpful by 73.3 per cent, and of some help by 25 per cent.
2. Teacher participation in the formulation of school policy was rated very helpful by 66.7 per cent, and of some help by 28.3 per cent.

3. Non-credit, in-service courses or workshops were rated very helpful by 31.7 per cent, and of some help by 48.3 per cent.
4. Periodic written teacher self-evaluations were rated very helpful by 65 per cent, and of some help by 23.3 per cent.
5. Periodic written evaluations of the teacher by the supervisor were rated very helpful by 38.3 per cent, and of some help by 45 per cent.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The first of three questions posed at the onset of this study was: "Would teachers not receiving supervision look upon such a program favorably should it be offered to them?" The results of a questionnaire survey of sixty teachers asked that question show that 80 per cent would welcome the introduction of supervision into their school programs. The fact that 68.3 per cent of the teachers selected the statement, "To aid teachers with their work" as the chief purpose of supervision seems to further indicate sincere interest in, and readiness for, supervision.

The second question to be investigated was: "How do teachers rate supervisory practices common to the Des Moines Elementary Schools?" Survey results show that thirteen of those fifteen practices listed were rated either very helpful,

or of some help, and that two of these practices--unscheduled classroom visits, and participation by the supervisor in classroom activities--were rated generally unhelpful, even detrimental. These findings verify the conclusions drawn by Frank C. Lorey, Jr. in his field study, "Supervisory Practices in the Des Moines Elementary Schools." Lorey says, "The program is basically sound. However, there are areas which could be improved upon."¹ The first four recommendations Lorey makes are:

- (1) Principals should not visit classrooms unannounced,
- (2) Principals should always schedule visits, (3) Principals should always make a pre-visitation diagnosis of the purpose of the visit with the teacher, and (4) Principals should not participate in classroom activities.²

The third, and last, question to be studied through the survey was: "Are there supervisory techniques not listed in Des Moines' program which teachers rate desirable?" Ratings of five such practices listed on the questionnaire show that teachers did see value in: (1) an orientation program for new teachers, (2) teacher participation in the formulation of school policy, (3) non-credit, in-service courses or workshops, (4) periodic written self-evaluations, and (5) periodic written evaluations of the teacher by the supervisor. The first, second, and fourth practices were rated especially helpful by teachers.

¹Lorey, op. cit., p. 43

²Ibid., pp. 42-43.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Melchior, William T. Instructional Supervision. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1950.
- Spears, Harold. Improving The Supervision Of Instruction. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953.
- Staff Relations In School Administration. Thirty-Third Yearbook. Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1955.

B. PERIODICALS

- Antell, Henry. "Teachers Appraise Supervision," Journal Of Educational Research, XXXVIII (April, 1945), 606-611.
- Bail, P. M. "Do Teachers Receive The Kind Of Supervision They Desire?" Journal Of Educational Research, XL (May, 1947), 713-716.
- Bartky, John. "Helping Teachers Teach," School And Society, LXVI (September, 1947), 241-244.
- Whitehead, M. J. "Teachers Look At Supervision," Educational Leadership, X (November, 1952), 101-106.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Lorey, Frank C., Jr. "Supervisory Practices In The Des Moines Elementary Schools." Unpublished Master's field report, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, 1955.

APPENDIX

COPY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO TEACHERS

Community: _____ Years of teaching experience: _____

Grade taught: K() 1() 2() 3() 4() 5() 6() Sex: M() F()

Have you received instructional supervision at any time during your teaching experience? Yes() No()

Would you look favorably on supervision should it be offered to you? Yes() No()

Which one of the following statements would you select to best describe the chief purpose of supervision:

- () To rate teacher performance, and serve as a guide for job promotion and salary increase.
- () To aid teachers with their work in order to increase expertness.
- () To set a specific curriculum to be followed by all teachers in order to insure a properly integrated program.

Below, and on the following pages, please indicate with a check mark how you would rate each practice. The fact that you may not be receiving supervision at this time should not deter you from indicating your judgment.

| Supervisory Practices | Very helpful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental |
|--|--------------|-----------|-------------|---------|------------------|
| 1. Classroom visit to observe procedures . | | | | | |
| 2. Unannounced class-room visit | | | | | |
| 3. Scheduled classroom visit | | | | | |
| 4. Classroom visit to experienced teacher not on probation . . | | | | | |

| Supervisory Practices | Very helpful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri- mental |
|---|--------------|-----------|-------------|---------|------------------|
| 5. Participation by supervisor in classroom activities | | | | | |
| 6. Pre-visitation diagnosis of purpose of visit . | | | | | |
| 7. Post-visitation conference, supervisor and teacher . | | | | | |
| 8. Observations kept in written form . . | | | | | |
| 9. Supervisor-teacher conferences for purposes other than post-visitation | | | | | |
| 10. Departmental conferences | | | | | |
| 11. Supervisor-teacher curriculum planning and evaluation | | | | | |
| 12. Intra-school visitation by new teachers with experienced teachers | | | | | |

| Supervisory Practices | Very helpful | Some help | Little help | No help | Detri-mental |
|--|--------------|-----------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| 13. Experienced teachers assigned to assist new teachers | | | | | |
| 14. Intra-school bulletin | | | | | |
| 15. Helps through teaching aids such as materials, books, and articles | | | | | |
| 16. Non-credit, in-service courses or workshops . . . | | | | | |
| 17. Teacher participation in the formulation of school policy | | | | | |
| 18. Orientation program for new teachers | | | | | |
| 19. Periodic written self-evaluation . . | | | | | |
| 20. Periodic written evaluation of the teacher by the supervisor | | | | | |